

Application S/N 10/643,327
Amendment Dated: December 15, 2005
Response to Office Action dated: August 15, 2005

CE11193J1210

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-19 remain pending in the application. In the Office Action, claims 1-9 and 11-19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,388,989 to Malhotra (Malhotra). In addition, claim 10 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Malhotra in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,507,760 to Baumgartner (Baumgartner).

A brief summary of the Malhotra reference may be helpful here. Malhotra describes a data transmission system that includes a CPU, an HDLC controller having a receive buffer and a memory shared between the CPU and the HDLC controller. The CPU initializes the HDLC controller by sending configuration data to the shared memory. During initialization, the CPU creates a valid buffer and sets the operating mode for the HDLC controller. The CPU terminates data reception by the HDLC controller by sending the controller data reception termination instructions, and the CPU will then create an empty buffer in the shared memory. The purpose of the empty buffer is to prevent memory overrun in the data transmission system (see the Abstract and col. 4, lines 32-60).

Independent claim 1 has been amended to clarify that the first processor manages the shared memory and dynamically allocates a message buffer to the second processor based on a specific request from the second processor to send a message to the first processor. Independent claim 15 has been similarly amended. Support for the amendments can be found in FIGs. 2 and 4, page 3, lines 11-17 and page 5, line 20 to page 6, line 1. No new matter has been added in view of the amendments. In addition, independent claim 11 also recites the feature of sending a request from the second

Application S/N 10/643,327
Amendment Dated: December 15, 2005
Response to Office Action dated: August 15, 2005

CE11193J1210

processor requesting an empty message buffer from the shared memory when the second processor needs to send a message to the first processor.

In contrast, the CPU in Malhotra creates a buffer in the shared memory in response to receiving a call from a user. That is, the CPU creates the buffer without any requests from the HDLC controller. The HDLC controller is merely a medium for transferring data between the user and the CPU, and it is completely dependent on memory allocations as determined by the CPU. Here, while the first processor manages the allocation of memory, the second processor is able to request space in the shared memory based on its determination, not that of the first processor. Such a system is far more flexible and efficient than the one described in Malhotra.

In view of the above, Applicants submit that independent claims 1, 11 and 15 are patentable over the prior art. Applicants also believe that those claims that depend from these independent claims are patentable, both based on their dependencies on the independent claims and their patentability on their own. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims is respectfully requested. Passing of this case is now believed to be in order, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. No amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

In the event that the Examiner deems the present application non-allowable, it is requested that the Examiner telephone the Applicants' attorney or agent at the number

Application S/N 10/643,327
Amendment Dated: December 15, 2005
Response to Office Action dated: August 15, 2005

CE11193JI210

indicated below so that the prosecution of the present case may be advanced by the clarification of any continuing rejection.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any necessary fee, or credit any overpayment, to Motorola, Inc. Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

Respectfully submitted,

SEND CORRESPONDENCE TO:

Motorola, Inc.
Law Department – MD 1610
8000 W. Sunrise Blvd.
Plantation, FL 33322

Customer Number: 24273

By: 

Larry G. Brown
Attorney of Record
Reg. No.: 45,834

Telephone: (954) 723-4295
Fax No.: (954) 723-3871